Applicant : Adiletta et al.
Serial No. : 10/615,500
Filed : 7/8/2003
Page : 5

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-075002
Intel Docket No.: P7567C

REMARKS

1. Claim Status

Claims 36-41 remain pending with claims 36, 38, and 40 being independent.

Applicants submit new claim 42 for consideration. No new matter has been added.

2. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claim 36 as unpatentable over Kogge (U.S. 5,475,856) in view of Agarwal (APRIL: A Processor Architecture for Multiprocessing). Agarwal teaches a system where a cache controller forces a multi-threaded processor to switch to another thread in response to a remote request (page 4, column 1, paragraph 3). As stated in Agarwal: "[w]hen control passes back to the thread that suffered a remote request, the controller should have completed servicing the request, provided the other threads ran for enough cycles" (page 4, column 2, paragraph 2). As correctly interpreted by the Examiner, other threads may execute to help cover-up the latency associated with a thread's remote request. However, in Agarwal, while there is a certain likelihood that the remote request will complete before control passes back to a swapped out thread, there is no guarantee. That is, control is not prevented from returning to a thread if the memory reference does not complete.

Claim 36 recites "logic to re-enable availability for execution of a one of multiple threads in response to a signal associated with a memory reference issued by the

Applicant : Adiletta et al.
Serial No. : 10/615,500
Filed : 7/8/2003
Page : 6

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-075002
Intel Docket No.: P7567C

thread". Again, in Agarwal, control may return to a given thread whether or not a remote request has been serviced. That is, after being swapped out a given thread remains available for execution (though it will likely not be executed for some time as other threads execute). Thus, Agarwal does not describe or suggest that a thread is removed from availability for execution after a remote request much less re-enabled based on a signal associated with a memory reference as recited by claim 36. For at least this reason, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 36 and its corresponding dependent claims.

Independent claims 38 and 40 recite similar limitations and Applications similarly request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 38 and 40 and their corresponding dependent claims.

Applicant : Adiletta et al.
Serial No. : 10/615,500
Filed   : 7/8/2003
Page   : 7

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-075002
Intel Docket No.: P7567C

If any fees are due, please apply such fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1050

referencing attorney docket number: 10559-075002.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/13/06

Robert A. Greenberg
Reg. No. 44,133
Phone: 978-553-2060